UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/090,685 | 03/05/2002 | Alfred Thomas | 07-2176-A | 8496 |

20306 7590 06/01/2011

MCDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP
300 S. WACKER DRIVE
32ND FLOOR
CHICAGO, IL 60606

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| MENDIRATTA, VISHU K | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 3711 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 06/01/2011 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

RECORD OF ORAL HEARING

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

---

*Ex parte* ALFRED THOMAS, DUNCAN F. BROWN,
LAWRENCE E. DEMAR and SCOTT D. SLOMIANY

---

Appeal No. 2010-005110
Application No. 10/090,685
Technology Center 3700

---

Oral Hearing Held: January 20, 2011

---

Before HUBERT LORIN, ANTON W. FETTING and
JOSEPH A. FISCHETTI, *Administrative Patent Judges.*

APPEARANCES:

ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANT:

MICHAEL H. BANIAK, ESQUIRE
McDonnell, Boehnen, Hulbert & Berghoff, LLP
300 South Wacker Drive
32nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 913-0001

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Thursday, January 20, 2011 commencing at 10:36 a.m., at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia, before Deborah Rinaldo, Notary Public.

PROCEEDINGS

- - - - -

MR. BANIAK: Good morning. It's good to see you all again. As I opened this file recently to take a look at it and decide oral argument or not, I said, this looks very familiar.

JUDGE LORIN: Yes, and it's the same panel.

MR. BANIAK: It is. I saw that. We can just open with, Are there further questions in view of what we said last time?

But I won't start just there. I will, however, start wherever you wish. I have gone through the transcript of the last hearing and I imagine you have that file also. And frankly, I think I covered everything that, you know, is currently of record with regard to the rejections of the Examiner. This had kind of a tortured history or tortious history in the way that it's gotten here today.

JUDGE LORIN: I think the record is complete now. We're at a point now where a decision will be made. But I do want you to review precisely -- this was something that came up in the last hearing. Explain this invention again and the two references that have been applied under 102.

MR. BANIAK: The invention is something of a combination of two fairly well known games. One is the game of Keno.

And if you have been to any casino or know of the game, it's essentially this. A game in which there's a matrix with numbers and locations on that matrix. And what the user, what the player does is select a number of spots, locations,

perhaps ten, could be more, depends on the nature of the game. So they pick ten spots, ten numbers.

The computer that runs the game then selects a bunch of spots of its own, 20, shall we say. Randomly picks those numbers. And then there's an issue of matching up. How many match, if any, with respect to the Keno game.

What's interesting about Keno is it has an element of selection by the player. Meaning the player has this idea, let's call it free will, that I am having some input as to what's going on because I have a choice of 80 spots and of those 80 spots I will pick some. These are now my spots. Then the machine takes over and sees whether there's matches or payout depending on matches or not.

The other game that we're talking about here today is a traditional slot machine game. They rotate, reels turn, things either match up along lines or they don't. Typically when I play it, they don't match up.

So those are reels. Again, now, in this instance in a reel-type machine, there is no input -- there is no selection by the player other than perhaps choosing what the maximum bet would be that that player wants to place and choosing the lines. I can select one line, five lines, 12 lines, whatever.

But that's the only input that is provided and there really isn't any selection. It's a function of here is my bet, that takes the number of lines, roll, matches up or it doesn't match up. So no real exercise of selection of input by the player.

The game that my client has come up with is a game which is somewhat like Keno and we call the game Spin Keno. Somewhat like Keno in the sense that we have this grid with locations on it but instead of having those matched up by a computer, what we do is we provide input. And this is a selection step.

As I emphasized the last time, the words we used in the claim are very important because those are the distinguishing features from Simunek, the primary reference that the Examiner uses, and Tarantino. But we'll get back to that in a second.

In our game the user selects spaces, selects locations, selects spots. And those now become reels in the sense of reels, R-E-E-L-S. Those are now spun. Every one of those is spun. So user selects, I have my input, my free will is being exercised. The computer spins those reels and depending on the methodology of the programming, matches occur or don't occur, payouts occur or don't occur along the way. Those are the broadest claims that we have. So there is this aspect of an input, a wager and then the game play occurs. Something then happens. But it happens that every one of those selections, those locations is going to be spun every time.

Compare that now -- that's our game. There are dependent claims and this is what came up subsequent to the last argument. Although, we did have it argued and briefed the last time around.

Dependent claims talk about in some instances, for example -- and I think claim 38 may be a good one as a dependency where we talk in terms of there may be an additional aspect to our game where a geometrical pattern can result in an additional win or an additional aspect of the game.

Geometrical in the sense that I may want a line so that if I get three cherries in a row, then further good things happen. Three cherries in a diagonal, good things happen.

Even in that particular instance, what we see though is that the player has to decide which of those locations may align, may come out in spots that are

going to end up in a pattern, end up in a line, end up in a diagonal line, for example.

So once again, we don't have the computer generating something which could or could not line up. What we do have is the user selecting the spaces. So the user would have to select four locations which are going to spin. Those four locations are in a pattern and if the user selected, well, then that four line up, four cherries and there's a win. So that's a for instance with respect to claim 38.

We turn now to the prior art. Simunek, for example. And what we see there, in Simunek, it's a traditional Keno game where the player is going to pick his or her numbers and the machine is now going to process and pick its 20 numbers. Something then happens in terms of a match or no match.

What Simunek adds to the equation which is different from a traditional Keno game are a couple of things. One is it has this super spot. So one of those locations chosen by the player could be the super spot which, if it's matched, then turns into a reel and spins for a multiplier. Kind of a bonus game.

There's another embodiment in Simunek, and this is what the Examiner primarily relied on or went to, where if there's a match that occurs and for each one of those matches what happens is those matches then turn into reels which are spun. And in particular, again, for a bonus type arrangement here. Although, to be fair to the Simunek reference it doesn't say that it has to be a bonus.

So what do we see in terms of differences between our independent claims and Simunek? The difference is, again, this aspect of free will. There is no selection.

The selection in Simunek is simply the user traditionally picking spots, picking numbers as in a Keno game. The machine then takes over from there. If there are matches, those matches then, which are going to be fewer -- we'll talk about the situation when they could be every one. But there are going to be fewer.

Those matches then are taken over by the machine and there's a machine that determines those are going to be reels and spins those. So it's less than all. So you can see that the difference between the two games that we have in terms of our claims and Simunek is regardless of any matches that may occur by the machine, our reels are going to be spun.

So the player has that gratification, has that knowledge that every one of those that I pick is going to result in a spinning reel and then something is going to happen after that. The machine doesn't intervene in that process in terms of are there matches? Then I may or may not spin matches. And that's what Simunek says.

What the Examiner says is there could be a theoretical situation where every one of the ten that the user has selected, the ten numbers that the user selected come up. The machine it hits those numbers. So now I have a situation where all those reels in that specific situation will now match and will be potentially spun, as Simunek says.

I look at that and the analogy I used the last time was, yes, we could have Romeo and Juliet reproduced by ten monkeys pounding on keyboards for ten to the 21 power years or so. They can come up with that. And in Simunek, yeah, I suppose there is a possibility, theoretical possibility that every one of those things can match. But that's not anticipation. Not such a farfetched

situation such as I am describing, such as the Examiner has reached in Simunek.

It's different in the sense that that is a very rare event. It's not something that is intended to happen in Simunek. And the machine essentially decides how many matches there are going to be randomly associated with that. That's Simunek.

JUDGE LORIN: All right, counsel. I'm again a little bit as confused as I was two years ago. We have in all these claims machine claims. There are no method claims here. What you are discussing here as a point of distinction is what your operating system is supposed to be doing in the system, this game playing machine.

Now, let's take it step by step. Your operating system in claim 25 requires driving a display to present game element locations. Now, Simunek does that, correct?

MR. BANIAK: Correct.

JUDGE LORIN: So that's not an issue. The next step that the operating system does is register a selection input by a player of game element locations. Doesn't Simunek do that?

MR. BANIAK: Yes.

JUDGE LORIN: Let's go on. The next is wherein said program limits said selection to less than all of said plurality of game element locations, which means you have ten locations originally, a selection input is registered for one location, say in the top right-hand corner. The program limits the selection which is that top right-hand corner -- I guess it limits to that selection. So now the top right-hand corner has been selected.

MR. BANIAK: Correct.
JUDGE LORIN: Are you saying Simunek does not do that?
MR. BANIAK: No. What I'm saying is Simunek is following a traditional Keno type arrangement. So far in our claim we are doing the same thing.
JUDGE LORIN: Let's go on here. Registering a wager input by the player upon outcome of said game of chance. Well, I think Simunek does that too, do they not?
MR. BANIAK: I would say yes.
JUDGE LORIN: Determining a game element indicia from a set of game play indicia to be displayed in at least said selected game element location. So that top right-hand corner, you could have anything come up. Say you have cherries come up. So all you are saying here is determining a cherry to show up in that location.
MR. BANIAK: Here is a distinction that I would say exists with Simunek in that Simunek is going to have the traditional Keno grid. So you are going to have ten up in that spot in Simunek. So there is no selection.
JUDGE LORIN: Why would they have ten in that spot? Why isn't the whole grid there in that location one of the spots?
MR. BANIAK: Well, I don't think you can treat the whole grid as a single spot. We're treating locations very specifically and our locations are going to be the game elements, each of which is going to turn into a reel when selected. In Simunek, you are not going to do that because you are going to have these numbers that are associated in there and the user is going to pick numbers. And then the machine generates random numbers thereafter.
JUDGE LORIN: In each location.

MR. BANIAK: I don't know that that's true, that it's going to be generated in each location.

JUDGE LORIN: Let's take a look at Simunek here. You have a grid here -- am I not understanding this correctly? On figure 1 of Simunek -- no, it's figure 4.

Figure 4 in Simunek, the numbers start 1 through 80. In the top right-hand corner is the number 10. Is that not a location?

MR. BANIAK: It is.

JUDGE LORIN: Is there not an indicia there?

MR. BANIAK: There is but it's not going to be indicia from a set of indicia. As we do with reels, we are going to have ten different kinds, shall we say, ten different types of indicia.

JUDGE LORIN: Let's get to that because so far we haven't gotten to that in the claim yet. I'm just reading each element. So far we just discussed determining game element indicia from a set of game -- no. We discussed registering input and then we said determining game element indicia from a set of game play indicia. So far I'm not seeing anything different with Simunek.

MR. BANIAK: Let's go with that, then.

JUDGE LORIN: Next, said game element indicia to be displayed in each instance being randomly assigned for each said game element location from entirety of said set game element indicia displaying said randomly determined indicia for each said selected game element location. That's a lot.

Now, I understand this to say that you are randomly assigning something in that location.

MR. BANIAK: Correct, random assignment in that location. Could be a cherry, could be a piece of fruit, could be anything. But what I'm saying is in the traditional Keno arrangement that we see here in Simunek, those numbers are already put there. The machine then randomly picks numbers and we see what matches up with what the user may have selected.

JUDGE LORIN: In traditional Keno you would have a board in front of you and you are comparing the number on that board that you've chosen with whatever shows up on that screen. They reproduce the grid on the screen and randomly pick numbers there.

MR. BANIAK: Yes. So here what we're saying is, no, we're going to have a set of indicia and they are going to be randomly assigned to each of those spaces. Now the player is going to pick and those are going to rotate based on the indicia that are available on that reel. So that's not what's going on here.

JUDGE LORIN: Let me stop you again here so I can maintain my clarity here. So far the screen that Simunek would use for someone playing the game that Simunek describes, so far the screen is doing what you are saying here in the claim.

MR. BANIAK: The screen you are looking at in Simunek, yes, it would do that. But if you look at the screen as reproduced in our figures and what we talk about, what happens is those indicia, whatever the fruit is, shall we say, that randomly assign to that because each of those is a potential reel that's going to include all of the indicia.

So imagine here what you would have to have is Simunek having in every one of these spaces, you know, 32, 33, 34, the entire gamut of fruit associated with each one of those. So that's where I say Simunek is Keno. We are not Keno.

Only in the sense of what the grid looks like and the initial process of selecting spaces on that grid can do picking numbers.

JUDGE LORIN: Well, the indicia could be a number. I mentioned cherries before, but we can pick with numbers.

MR. BANIAK: Yeah, because you're going to have one indicium which is what you just said, not indicia, associated with each spot. Because our game now is going to be all about reels. It's not all about a number matching up with what the computer is going to generate.

JUDGE LORIN: Well, if you look at Keno, you can go to Maryland and play this in the bars and you see Keno on the screen and you select one, you know, and they just put up new numbers on that space. That's no different than what I'm reading here, right? Isn't that what's going on here so far?

MR. BANIAK: Okay. Let's continue because we haven't gotten to the meat of where I say we really differ from Simunek.

JUDGE LORIN: The next thing is determining the outcome of said game of chance based upon said game play condition.

So normally when Keno is played videowise, the computer stops and numbers show up. So that's the outcome. And finally you say, and providing a payout according to a winning condition.

So if you played video Keno and your number that you've chosen for a particular spot on the video, if they match, you get a payout. So far I'm not seeing any difference.

MR. BANIAK: Well, all right. I think we've gotten through to the end of the claim but the difference is that the selection process results in a display which is going to include this random association of whatever we have, call it fruit again, for each space.

That is not anything that's in the traditional Keno game. That is not anything that is talked about in Simunek at all. So I guess that's where I have to continue to differ with you because we are randomly using -- we're talking about the random assignment of indicia to a space but every space. Not just a machine selection of numbers.

JUDGE LORIN: Let me stop you, counsel, because, you know, this happened before in the earlier hearing and the more we talk about it the more I'm getting confused here.

You are going back now and you are pointing out this limitation, displayed in each instance being randomly assigned. Is that what you are saying is the distinction between your claim and what's in Simunek?

MR. BANIAK: The selection of each of those so that there is a random, I'll call it a reel even though that word doesn't appear in this particular case.

JUDGE LORIN: Correct, there are no reels in this claim.

MR. BANIAK: Correct. There's a random assignment that is now occurring of the subset of indicia that is available for each of those spaces.

JUDGE LORIN: Where is the subset?

MR. BANIAK: Well, you don't see the word subset in there but that is a derivative of what we're talking about, determining a game element indicium from a set of game play indicia to be displayed in at least said selected game element locations.

What we're talking about there is we're selecting this game element indicia from a set to be displayed in at least the selected game element locations and the game element indicia to be displayed in each instance being randomly assigned for each said game element location from the entirety of the set.

So that's the guts of it. That's the difference. That is what constitutes in my broad lexicon the reel.

JUDGE LORIN: Well, never mind the reel because there's no reel in the claim here. We don't need to harp on the reel. I thought we already addressed this. What is the difference between displaying in each instance a random number, which is what Keno does?

MR. BANIAK: I don't think Keno does it. I don't believe Keno does display a random number in every one of these spots.

JUDGE LORIN: When I have a board, as Simunek describes, a board of numbers and I choose a number in the top right-hand corner, say I want that number to be ten and I look up on the screen and they throw random numbers, don't I win when the number that appears in the top right-hand corner of the video screen rolls into a ten?

MR. BANIAK: But you selected that ten spot. Nothing happens in that ten spot. That's just your selection. So, yes, you match whatever the computer has thrown up there as a number. But that ten spot has not changed, has it?

JUDGE FETTING: What do you mean it hasn't changed?

JUDGE LORIN: The number in the ten spot hasn't changed?

MR. BANIAK: Correct.

JUDGE LORIN: It stays ten forever?

MR. BANIAK: Yes.

JUDGE LORIN: You mean, so if I choose ten in the top right corner, I win every time?

MR. BANIAK: No. The machine then selects what it is that is going to be --

JUDGE LORIN: In ten. Ten is simply an identifier for that location.

MR. BANIAK: It is. But what I'm saying is the ten doesn't change.

JUDGE LORIN: Of course not because it is a location number. It's not the indicia.

MR. BANIAK: Correct, and we have indicia that change every time by virtue of the random association with that spot. That's the claim language that we used.

JUDGE LORIN: All right. Turn now to Tarantino. Now, Tarantino has also locations.

MR. BANIAK: Tarantino is by the Examiner and we can go to the exemplar of figure 6 which is what the Examiner has relied on. And it's really the only embodiment that has given any kind of structure and discussion in Tarantino. What Tarantino does is provide a wager input. Put money in and then you get a first column. The Examiner has taken the position that first column equals location.

And we specifically state and show that that is not a location. That is nothing more than, for example, choosing a line in a slot machine. So you put your wager in, your $0.25, you get the first column. If you manage to get a match, according to Tarantino in that first play, then you have the ability to go to a second play. Put in another quarter. Now you get columns 2 and 3. Again, basically just lines. That can continue as you progress through the game that Tarantino describes with the ultimate objective that you are going to have this linkage that may occur by virtue of matches between the first column and the second and third column, the fourth column, et cetera, to some end. We indicate that there is no selection that's going on. No selection with respect to an input from the player. You simply put your wager in and depending what your wager is, that's what you get, a column, two columns,

three columns, four columns, et cetera. So no selection whatsoever occurring there.

Plus again, we're not dealing with a player using the locations. What we're seeing in Tarantino is the usage of nothing more than what I described as lines that would be traditional in a slot machine.

Plus, we don't have this kind of replacement that we talked about and the matching that we talked about with respect to each of the selections made by the player. That is in a nutshell why Tarantino doesn't apply as an anticipation.

JUDGE LORIN: Again, Tarantino is similar to what we just discussed. I'm seeing here a grid of nine by nine, it seems. Why aren't these all locations where these dice show up? These are not locations?

MR. BANIAK: They are not locations that a user can select. And that is the critical distinction that we have in the claim. There is no registering selection input with respect to less than all, for example, in that first column. You put your wager in, you get the first column, you see what happens.

JUDGE LORIN: It's done automatically. That first column just pops up. The Examiner doesn't have any choice in --

MR. BANIAK: Correct. You have no choice. You can't pick, for example, I would like the first column and the fifth column. That is not anything disclosed in Tarantino. It's not part of the process. Tarantino deals with an iterative type game where you build from one stage to the next. As you succeed or don't succeed you put the money in and it builds up there. But no selection whatsoever with regard to spaces, spots that we talk about.

That's where we say the Examiner is pushing this disclosure in a way to try to match up with our claims but there is no selection input by a player. There is no limitation in that selection to -- less than all in that column. So we don't see Tarantino as very relevant at all.

JUDGE LORIN: Your claim calls for registering a selection input of a game element location. And it's that location which will be randomly assigned an indicia.

MR. BANIAK: Correct.

JUDGE LORIN: And you are saying that this figure 6 there's no registering of an input because there is no input.

MR. BANIAK: Correct. The Examiner has basically conflated the wager with there's your input.

JUDGE LORIN: Okay.

JUDGE FETTING: I want to make sure I understand. Can I go back to Keno for a second? I have seen it so often and I have never played it. I have seen this grid of numbers.

Now, I wasn't sure what happened when things are randomly happening. Is it the case that all that's happening is the numbers stay the same and they are either darkening or somehow highlighting so the numbers indicating those are the numbers that are in the winning group?

MR. BANIAK: Yes.

JUDGE FETTING: So they are not going to change the symbols in each of those. They are just indicating which of those numbers are amongst the winning group?

MR. BANIAK: Are the winners depending on what the computer has decided as to its random selection.

JUDGE FETTING: In your claim you actually are changing. There is no number. There's some other sort of symbol and the symbol can be different

JUDGE FETTING: In your claim you actually are changing. There is no number. There's some other sort of symbol and the symbol can be different each time?

MR. BANIAK: Correct. If you go and look at one of our figures, and you've described exactly what the point of difference is, Your Honor. If you look at our figure 6 or 7 -- it's figure 5. You look at figure 5 and in figure 5 -- do you have it in front of you? I can bring it up.

JUDGE LORIN: We have it here.

MR. BANIAK: You see in figure 5 what happens after you've made your selection process. Those locations that you have selected are shown in the black boxes indicated by 18 in that figure. Unselected are 12, whatever. And then the machine says those are your selections, now we're going to rotate. You are certainly going to rotate at least the selected boxes, you know, because it's prettier and more graphic. You can rotate all of them. It doesn't really matter.

JUDGE FETTING: You could rotate all of them but the only ones that matter are the selected boxes?

MR. BANIAK: That's correct. So you rotate the selected boxes and then the question is, all right, now -- and you go to fig 6. Now in those selected boxes have I come up with matches? You see that in this particular instance we show a 28 match, match, match.

So in this instance they all rotate and either you get cherries or a piece of fruit or an umbrella or whatever, but they, all of the sets of indicia are on each one of those spaces and all of those things come up.

All of those could have come up as umbrellas or all of them could have come up as something different. That's not Keno. That's not what's going on in each one of those spaces in Keno. You are not rotating all those so that they all come up as number 37.

And, you know, you may look at that, Judge Lorin, for example, and say, Is that really all that much different from Simunek and what Simunek is doing with the Keno game?

And the answer is, yeah, it is extremely different because it's all about entertainment and it's all about whether the game is going to be something that people are going to look at and like. And what we see in Simunek, as far as we're concerned, is a game that isn't going to be popular and has never been popularized because it lacks that element of free will that I described.

JUDGE FETTING: It's almost like you have a bank of slot machines and you get to pick which slot machines and you yank the arm on all of them simultaneously and see what that combination is like.

MR. BANIAK: I suppose that is one way of looking at it. It's all completely random. It's all done by the machine. In a Keno game, of course the machine is deciding what's going on.

Simunek is even a step further in the sense that Simunek says I'm not even going to give you that ability on the first pull. You are only going to get that ability if you get matches. And of those matched numbers, I'll spin it for you and see where you get.

So we see that as a point of distinction and it's in the language that we've got in claim 25, which we went to. I hope we can figure that out better in view of my explanation. It does come out in the dependencies too. We actually do talk about reel type machines and there's a reel associated in the dependencies.

JUDGE LORIN: I'm not, not appreciating the distinction you are making. This is under 102. So there has to be identical and I'm cognizant of that. My difficulty isn't that I understand what you are saying is a distinction you want the invention to have over the prior art. It's what your claim actually says.

We don't have any reels. We don't have anything you are talking about. What we have is determining a game element indicia from a set of game play indicia to be displayed. You have a grid, okay, in the prior art, and you are displaying one of them. Say you are displaying ten.

JUDGE FETTING: There's a white ten and a black ten. You are either just playing a white ten and a black ten.

JUDGE LORIN: Yeah, to show up, right. If the computer picks it, it will probably show up as white.

Said game element indicia to be displayed in each instance being randomly assigned. And what you are saying is that ten that's there has not been randomly assigned.

MR. BANIAK: No. It's in that spot. That's the grid that you go to in Keno. The numbers are there. What we're doing is we're randomly assigning to every one of those spots something out of this set that we've described in the claim.

JUDGE FETTING: But you could be randomly assigning a white ten or a black ten to that spot.

MR. BANIAK: No. That is not what's going on in Keno. That's not what's going on in this particular disclosure of Simunek, which is a traditional Keno game. It modifies the Keno game from what we know as Keno.

It is not a ten or whatever. If the designer says I want a white ten up there, fine. You put a white ten up there. But it's a ten. It's not going to be a piece of fruit, it's not going to be an umbrella, it's not going to be a number, it's not going to be a dollar sign.

JUDGE FETTING: Yeah, but the claim only sends indicia.

MR. BANIAK: Well, indicia, but what I keep trying to come back to is the random assignment in each of those instances are an indicia from the set that we have defined in the claim for those. A game from a set of game elements from differing indicia. Selecting game elements from a set and then randomly assign those to each of these locations.

Otherwise, there's no matching that is going to occur and that's what's critical to this. It's not matching by something that the computer is going to select on that grid but something that matches with respect to each of these game element locations which gives you the spin action.

And acknowledging that in that claim 25 it's not there in terms of the word spin. But you go to claim 34, for example, and then it says, all right, now I'm going to put it in a reel. So to the extent that we need to rely on a reel, we've got it in the dependencies.

We also have in claim 47, for example, a slot type machine using a spinning reel visual presentation. And then we go through and talk about how those reels are presented using the word spinning at least said selected reels for a game play condition.

JUDGE FETTING: But in claim 25 I don't see the word matching. It just says, Based upon said game play condition.

MR. BANIAK: Game element indicia to be displayed in each instance being randomly assigned, determining an outcome based upon said game play condition.

JUDGE FETTING: So whether it's a white ten or a black ten is a condition.

MR. BANIAK: You are correct.

JUDGE FETTING: So 28 could be a little broader than you are suggesting.

MR. BANIAK: Twenty-five could be, in fact, a little broader. Certainly broader than the claim 47 which I just described. Certainly broader than the claims which actually call out using a reel and get down more into, you know, the actual embodiments that we described in the invention is the function of claim drafting.

JUDGE LORIN: All right, counsel. I think after two years we're ready to make a decision. Expect one soon.

MR. BANIAK: Thank you very much, gentlemen.

JUDGE FETTING: I have to say you were very helpful in allowing us to understand finally what's going on here.

MR. BANIAK: I hope so. I thought I'll just submit this on the record before but I don't know. Last time there weren't many questions. This time there certainly were. I hope that it did help.

JUDGE LORIN: It did. Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, the proceedings at 11:15 a.m., were concluded.)

1
2
3
4
5